

## MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES EXPANSION, FUNDING. TAX ON PERSONAL INCOMES ABOVE \$1 MILLION. INITIATIVE STATUTE.

PROP

63

### ARGUMENT Against Proposition 63

Proposition 63 is a *flawed attempt* to fix a serious problem. Californians are compassionate, and that's why we care about making sure that government is both responsible AND effective. This tax initiative, however, is neither. It promises wonderful things, but the *benefit is much smaller* and the *price tag much larger* than proponents are telling you.

This new law forces the Legislature to continue funding existing mental health programs at their current levels, *regardless of effectiveness or efficiency*. While United States Department of Justice investigations have found severe abuses within California's Department of Mental Health, proponents suggest we expand that system rather than first resolving the problems it already faces.

As if that weren't bad enough, Proposition 63 pins the hopes and needs of thousands of Californians upon a **NARROWLY DRAWN SEGMENT OF A FEW TAX-PAYERS' INCOMES**. That is not wise, and it is not safe. Of course, most people aren't millionaires, but when those required to pay this tax end up leaving the state—the way they have been in increasing numbers since the Gray Davis days—they will take their tax dollars with them. *The very same tax dollars this program needs to survive*. That leaves the rest of us stuck trying to pay the tab, and helplessly watching other important services get cut to make up the difference.

On paper, this plan promises a lot. Helping the mentally ill sounds good. However, the measure itself is

fatally flawed, because its funding structure is too narrowly drawn and *highly vulnerable to even slight economic changes*. So, you see, the failure to provide a long-term solution for mental health needs in our state will only create even *bigger problems* that need to be solved . . . and leave us with the original challenges, as well.

It is compassionate to help, but this plan is the *wrong way to do it*. It is time for real reform—not irresponsible measures like this one that merely substitute one broken bureaucracy for another. All Californians deserve a government that plans for the future, not one that threatens it with a nightmarish, risky scheme that will leave us with larger problems than ever before.

Join many Californians from all walks of life, including community leaders, state legislators, health care advocates, elected city officials, and others who care about the people in our communities in voting NO on this *well-intended but short-sighted* initiative. In the long run, this backward plan will only hurt those it's meant to help.

DR. WILLIAM ALLEN, *Professor*  
*UCLA Department of Economics*

THE HONORABLE RAY HAYNES, *Assemblyman*  
*California State Legislature*

LEW UHLER, *President*  
*National Tax Limitation Committee*

### REBUTTAL to Argument Against Proposition 63

#### PROPOSITION 63 HELPS EVERYONE IN CALIFORNIA.

Treating mental illness doesn't just mean helping individuals.

It means better schools and businesses, and safer communities.

Successful treatment keeps adults healthy, employed, and self-sufficient. It helps children stay and succeed in school. Police can focus on crime, instead of untreated mental illness.

#### PROPOSITION 63 EXPANDS A PROGRAM THAT WORKS.

After decades of neglecting mental illness, California began an experimental, community-based mental health program five years ago. It helps teenagers and adults get the care they need from one place. Special community teams offer treatment, medicines, housing, job training, and other assistance.

The program has been studied extensively. (See [www.AB34.org](http://www.AB34.org).) The results show that three times more people found employment than had worked previously. Those enrolled had a 66% reduction in hospital days, and an 81% reduction in jail days.

A panel of nationally recognized experts calls this program a model for the nation.

Right now, the program is small, reaching *fewer than 10%* of those who could benefit. Thousands are turned away.

*Proposition 63 makes this new model program available to the thousands now turned away.*

#### PROPOSITION 63 REQUIRES STRICT ACCOUNTABILITY.

Under Proposition 63:

- Funding goes only to these proven, new programs.
- Bureaucrats can't redirect the funding.
- An oversight panel of independent, unpaid members supervises expenditures.
- To ensure accountability, they can cut off programs that aren't effective.

Proposition 63 only taxes individuals on their taxable, personal income over \$1 million. The tax is just 1%. It's even deductible from federal taxes.

Please vote YES on Proposition 63.

CARLA NIÑO, *President*  
*California State PTA*

ARETA CROWELL, *President*  
*Mental Health Association in California*

DR. DANA WARE, *President*  
*California Academy of Family Physicians*